EXHIBIT 1

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN				
2	SOUTHERN DIVISION				
3					
4	IN RE: AUTOMOTIVE PARTS ANTITRUST LITIGATION		Case No. 12-2311		
5			Hon. Marianne O. Battani		
6					
7	THIS RELATES TO:				
8	In Re: Wire Harnes		-	-cv-00101	
9	In Re: Instrument In Re: Fuel Sender	îs	2:12-	-cv-00301	
10	In Re: Heater Cont In Re: Alternators	5	2:12-	-cv-00701	
11	In Re: Windshield In Re: Starters	Wipers systems	2:12- 2:12-	-cv-00901 -cv-01101	
12	In Re: Starters In Re: Ignition Co In Re: Fuel inject	oils	2:12-	-cv-01401	
12	In Re: Power Windo	ow Motors	2:12-	-cv-02201 -cv-02301	
13	In Re: Air Conditi	loning Systems	2:12-	-cv-02701	
1 1	In Re: Windshield				
14	In Re: Spark Plugs In Re: Oxygen Sens			-cv-03001 -cv-03101	
15	in ke. Oxygen bent	5015	2.12	CV 03101	
16					
17	MOTION HEARINGS				
18	BEFORE SPECIAL MASTER GENE ESSHAKI				
19	Theodore Levin United States Courthouse				
20	231 West Lafayette Boulevard Detroit, Michigan Friday, December 2, 2016				
21	Friday, December 9, 2016				
22					
23					
24					
25	To obtain a copy of this official transcript, contact: Robert L. Smith, Official Court Reporter (313) 964-3303 • rob_smith@mied.uscourts.gov				

compelled to follow Goodyear.

As a consequence, I must hold that request number 31 to the extent that it requests evidence of settlement negotiations between the defendants and the original equipment manufacturers will not be enforced, those discussions and the evidence concerning those discussions are barred. However, in my view the discussions that occurred at the initial meetings where the defendants disclosed to the original equipment manufacturers the existence of a conspiracy, the nature, the scope and the duration of this conspiracy, the parts that may have been involved in the conspiracy are not settlement negotiations, they are a prelude to settlement negotiations, they are disclosing the wrongful acts, and settlement negotiations occurred after that disclosure.

So to the extent that request 31 seeks information concerning the initial meetings where the disclosures of the conspiracy, the scope, the nature, the extent and the duration and the number of parts were involved or discussed they are not privileged. Additionally, I think even under Goodyear the final settlement agreements that may have been reached between the parties are not subject to settlement privilege, so to that extent I am denying in part and granting in part the plaintiffs' request to enforce rule number 31.